A N

ANSWER

To THREE Late

PAMPHLETS.

VIZ.

I. A *Requeſt* to *Proteſtants*, to Produce Plain Scripture, directly Authorizing theſe their Tenets.

II. A *Dialogue* between a New *Catholick Convert* and a *Proteſtant*.

III. *Lucilla* and *Elizabeth*.

LONDON,
Printed for *Tho. Baſſet* at the *George* near St. *Dunſtan's* Church in *Fleetſtreet*. 1687.

Harvard College Library
Treat Fund
February 24, 1932

An Answer to the Request to Protestants,

(a) *To produce Plain Scriptures directly Authorizing these their Tenets.*

(a) *Ans.* WE do indeed make the Scripture the Rule of our Faith, because we believe God gave us the Scripture to be our Rule, and we know not where to meet with a better; and therefore we do not quarrel at this Request to produce plain Scripture-proofs for what we believe; but we may justly quarrel at the fallacious or unskilful way of stating it, as if we pretended to own no Doctrines, but what are contained in the express Words of Scripture; and therefore, to understand this matter, we must consider the several kinds of Doctrines professed in the Church of *England*, and what kind of proof from Scripture, they are capable of.

1*st*, The positive Articles of Faith, such as are contained in the Creed, and expressly taught in Scripture, we prove from plain and express Testimonies of Scripture, and are ready to give our proofs of them, when they are demanded. But besides these, 2*ly*, we have a great many Negative Articles, opposed to the Corruptions and Innovations of the Church of *Rome*: Now to believe a Negative, is only to believe that such a Doctrine is not taught in Scripture; and it would be a very wise Request, to desire us to prove by plain and express Scripture, that such a Doctrine is not taught in Scripture. We believe it is not there, because we cannot find it in Scripture, and those who pretend it is there, cannot shew it there; which is proof enough, and

all that the thing is capable of. 3*ly*, There are other Doctrines, which, it may be, are not in a ſtrict Senſe, Articles of Faith, but great and uſeful Truths; which cannot be proved by expreſs Words of Scripture, but by immediate and neceſſary Conſequence; and it is ridiculous in theſe Caſes, to demand a *direct* Proof, if by that he means the expreſs words of Scripture, for we never pretended to that in ſuch matters, but think it very reaſonable to believe an evident Conſequence, as well as expreſs Words. Since our Saviour proved the Reſurrection it ſelf by Conſequence, *Matth.* 22. 32. Having premiſed this, I ſhall examine, what it is he would have proved, in which alſo he has betrayed great want either of skill or honeſty, as will appear from particulars.

I. *Scripture is clear, in all Neceſſaries, to every Sober Enquirer.*

A. He begins well with demanding a Scripture proof; That the *Scripture is clear in all Neceſſaries*; as if we Proteſtants wanted a Scripture proof that the Sun ſhines, when we ſee it. Can there be any better proof, that the Scripture is clear and plain, than its own plainneſs? And therefore, every plain Text proves its own plainneſs. If this Propoſition, *Scripture is clear in all Neceſſaries, to every Sober Enquirer*, were contained in expreſs Words in Scripture; yet if we could not find it plain, we ſhould rather queſtion, whether thoſe Words are plain, than believe the Scripture to be plain, when we do not find it ſo. But if I find the Scripture plain, the plainneſs of the Scripture proves it ſelf, and needs no other proof. And yet this is one of thoſe Propoſitions, which may be proved by plain and neceſſary Conſequence from the Scripture. For if the *word of God be a Light unto our Feet, and a Lamp unto our Paths*, then it muſt be clear, if Light be clear, *Pſal.* 119. 105. If it *be able to make men wiſe unto Salvation*, 2 Tim. 3. 15. then it muſt be plain and intelligible in all things neceſſary to Salvation.

II. *The*

II. *The Secular Prince hath all Spiritual Juriſdiction and Authority, immediately, from and under God.*

A. What Authority the Church of *England* grants to Kings in matters of Religion, which he here calls all *Spiritual Juriſdiction, and Authority*, we are taught in the 37*th* Article of Religion: *The Kings Majeſty hath the chief power in this Realm of* England, *and other his Dominions, unto whom the chief Government of all Eſtates of this Realm, whether they be Eccleſiaſtical or Civil in all cauſes doth appertain, and is not, and ought not to be ſubject to any foreign Juriſdiction.* Which is further explained, *That we give not our Princes, the Miniſtring of God's Word, or of the Sacraments,——but that only Prerogative which we ſee to have been given always to all Godly Princes in Holy Scriptures by God himſelf, that is, that they ſhould rule all Eſtates and Degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be Eccleſiaſtical or Temporal, and reſtrain with the Civil Sword the ſtubborn and evil doers.* Which ſignifies no more, than that the King is ſupreme in his own Dominions, and therefore there is no Power, neither Secular nor Eccleſiaſtick above him; for if there were, he were not Supreme; Muſt we then prove by expreſs Scripture, that the King is Supreme? Do men want Scripture to prove, That Supreme Power is Supreme? Thus ſome men are always in the Extremes, either the Scripture ſignifies nothing, or it muſt be every thing, Grammar, and Dictionary and Logick, and Statute-book, and all; but can they prove by expreſs Scripture, that the King has the Supreme power in Civil cauſes? Then I will prove, That he has the Supreme power in Eccleſiaſtical cauſes; and I think *Rom.* 13. 1. *Let every Soul be ſubject to the Higher Powers*, is a ſufficient proof of both.

III. *Juſtification by Faith alone* (viz. *a Perſuaſion that we are juſtified*) *is a wholeſome Doctrine.*

A. Our Church does teach, *That Juſtification by Faith only is a moſt wholeſome Doctrine, and very full of comfort*, Article

ticle 11. but ſhe does not teach, *That juſtifying Faith is a perſuaſion, that we are juſtified*; and ſure we are not bound to prove that by Scripture, which we do not believe.

IV. *The Subſtance of Bread and Wine remains after, what it was before, Sacerdotal Conſecration.*

A. Our Church teaches, That *Tranſubſtantiation (or the change of the ſubſtance of Bread and Wine) in the Supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by Holy Writ*, Art. 28. But ſhe does not teach, That *the Bread and Wine remain after, what they were before Sacerdotal Conſecration.* Their ſubſtance is the ſame, that is, they are Bread and Wine ſtill, but by virtue of Chriſt's Inſtitution, after Conſecration they are not meer Bread and Wine, but *a Sacrament of our Redemption by Chriſt's death, and to ſuch as rightly, worthily, and by faith receive the ſame, the Bread which we break, is a partaking of the Body of Chriſt, and likewiſe the cup of bleſſing is a partaking of the Blood of Chriſt.* The ſubſtance of Bread and Wine is the ſame, but the Inſtitution gives it ſuch a new relation and uſe, as is equivalent to changing its nature, and makes it the Sacramental Body and Blood of Chriſt. And this the words of Inſtitution are an expreſs proof of, *This is my Body*; for if it be not his Natural Body, as ſenſe and reaſon tell us it cannot be, then it muſt be only his Sacramental Body, or his Body by Inſtitution. Chriſt was viſibly preſent with his Apoſtles in his own Natural Body, when he inſtituted this Sacrament, and therefore they could not underſtand, and our Saviour could never intend they ſhould believe, that the Bread which he bleſſed and brake, was his Natural Body, which they ſaw before their eyes; that they ate their Lord, when they ate the Conſecrated Bread, that they ſwallowed him down into their ſtomachs, and yet all this while ſaw him, and converſed with him, as they did at other times. The Bread is the Body of Chriſt, but it is his broken Body, which it could not be at the Inſtitution of this Sacrament; for Chriſt was not then Crucified, his Natural

Body

Body was not yet broken, and therefore the broken bread, though it was his Sacramental, could not be his Natural Body; his Blood was not then ſhed, and therefore though the Wine was *his Blood of the New Teſtament*, it could not be his Natural Blood which is ſhed for the remiſſion of ſins, unleſs his Natural Body was broken, and his Blood ſhed before he was crucified. Now I take that to be the expreſs ſenſe of Scripture, which is the only ſenſe that can be made of it; for a ſenſe in which it is impoſſible, is none at all.

V. *Our Lord's Preſence in or with the Euchariſt is meerly gracious and influential; and, if more, only to the Faithful.*

A. There is no ſuch Propoſition as this taught by the Church of *England*, that I know of; we own the influences of the Divine Grace to accompany the external adminiſtration of the Lord's Supper; and this I ſuppoſe, they will not put us to prove. We own the Sacramental Body and Blood of Chriſt, that is, the Conſecrated Elements, to be really preſent upon the Altar, and *verily* and *indeed* eaten of the Faithful; for ſo our Saviour expreſly tells us, *This is my Body*, and *This is my Blood*; and this is ſomewhat more than to ſay, that *our Lord's Preſence in or with the Euchariſt is meerly gracious and influential*: for ſo he is preſent in all other Religious Duties; but here he is ſo preſent, that his Body and Blood, with all the benefits of his Death and Paſſion, are exhibited to worthy Receivers, as much as they could have been, had we eat his Natural fleſh, and drank his blood. And therefore whatever difference they would allow, between Chriſt's gracious and influential preſence in the Euchariſt, and eating his Natural fleſh and blood, had that been poſſible, the ſame we allow between his gracious Preſence, and eating his Sacramental Body, which is to all the ends and purpoſes of a Sacrament, the ſame by his own Inſtitution, with his Natural fleſh and blood; for the carnal feeding on Chriſt's fleſh, is not a Sacramental eating of him.

But

But if by *more* he means, that Chriſt is corporally preſent in the Euchariſt, that his natural Fleſh and Blood is contained under the Species of Bread and Wine, this we deny, and it being a Negative Article, it is ridiculous, as I obſerved before, to demand expreſs Scripture, to prove that it is not in the Scripture; let thoſe, who affirm it, prove by expreſs Scripture, that it is there; for *this is my Body, and this is my Blood*, will not do it: We own, that it is the Body and Blood of Chriſt, as well as they; and therefore they muſt prove, that it is Chriſt's natural Body and Blood, and it is well for them, that they have ſomething elſe than Scripture to truſt to.

VI. *Adoration of the Euchariſt* (i. e. *of our Saviour under the Species of Bread and Wine*) *is Idolatry.*

A. Nor is there any ſuch Propoſition as this taught in the Church of *England*. We teach indeed, that Bread and Wine in the Euchariſt, remains Bread and Wine after Conſecration, and that to adore Bread and Wine is Idolatry, as *Romaniſts* themſelves confeſs, and is eaſily proved from Scripture, if to give Divine Worſhip to Creatures be Idolatry. To adore our Saviour is no Idolatry, but to adore Bread and Wine for our Saviour may be as much Idolatry, as to worſhip the Sun for God. But this Author puts a fallacy upon his Readers, by an explanatory Parentheſis, *Adoration of the Euchariſt* (i. e. *of our Saviour under the Species of Bread and Wine*) as if they only worſhipped our Saviour under the Species of Bread and Wine; whereas they teach that the Species themſelves (whatever they be, to be ſure, not Chriſt himſelf) are to be worſhipped together with Chriſt; and therefore, according to their own Doctrine, they muſt worſhip ſomething which is not Chriſt. And let them conſider, what name to give this.

See the late Diſcourſe of the Adoration of the Hoſt, p. 8, 9. &c.

VII. *All Chriſtians, whenever they communicate, are oblig'd to receive in both Kinds.*

A. And why does he not ask us to prove, That *all Chriſtians, whenever they communicate, are obliged to receive the Bread?*

bread? For there is the ſame Inſtitution for the Wine, that there is for the Bread. There is no other rule in matters of Inſtitution, but to obſerve the Inſtitution; and ſince the Sacrament was inſtituted in both kinds, and neither Chriſt nor his Apoſtles have told us, that it is ſufficient to receive in one kind, we think this reaſon enough to aſſert, That all Chriſtians when they do communicate, muſt communicate in both kinds. And indeed this Sacrament is not compleat without it; for if we conſider it as a ſpiritual Feaſt, Wine as well as Bread, to drink as well as to eat, is eſſential to a Feaſt; if we conſider the End of the Inſtitution, to be a commemoration of the Death of Chriſt, and the expiation of his Blood, how can we commemorate Sacramentally the expiation of his Blood, without drinking his Blood, which is ſhed for the remiſſion of ſins? For to eat his Blood together with his Fleſh, as they pretend, does not repreſent his broken Body, and his Blood ſhed, but his whole Body with Fleſh and Blood together, which contradicts the very Inſtitution of this Supper. And if we partake of no benefits in the Sacrament, but what we Sacramentally commemorate, I would deſire this Author to tell me, how thoſe who do not drink the Blood of Chriſt, *this blood of the New Teſtament*, obtain the remiſſion of their ſins? A very material thing for thoſe to conſider, who would be ſure of their Salvation.

VIII. *Chaſtity, deliberately vow'd, may be inoffenſively violated.*

A. This is no Doctrine of our Church, nor are Proteſtants now concerned in it, though ſome of the Monks and Nuns at the beginning of the Reformation were. There was no ſuch thing known as vowing Chaſtity, as that ſignifies a Vow againſt Marriage; neither under the Law, nor in the times of Chriſt and his Apoſtles; and therefore we cannot expect in Scripture an expreſs deciſion of this matter, but muſt argue from the nature and obligation of Vows. And if he pleaſe to conſult the Writings of the firſt Reformers, who were concerned to vindicate themſelves in this point, he will find it eaſier to condemn what they did,

than to anſwer the reaſons, whereby they juſtifie it. Theſe Vows were never thought ſo Sacred, but that the Pope can diſpenſe with them; and what is diſpenſable, neceſſity will diſpenſe with on courſe; and that they themſelves knew beſt. Theſe Monaſtick Vows were undertaken as the moſt excellent ſtate of Religion, as meritorious of pardon and juſtification, which is a fulſom ſuperſtition and corruption of Chriſtianity, and therefore are void and null as all other ſuperſtitions are. And if Monaſtick Vows, as ſuch, do not oblige, as no ſuperſtitions can; then they were free to uſe that liberty, which God and Chriſt had allowed them. But who taught him to call a Vow againſt Marriage, a Vow of Chaſtity, when Marriage it ſelf is a ſtate of Chaſtity? And tho' it be lawful to vow Chaſtity, which is a neceſſary duty, let him prove, that it is lawful for any man, nay a boy, or girl, to vow not to marry, when our Saviour himſelf tells us, this is not in every mans power; and nothing can be a lawful matter for a Vow, but what is in our power. Chriſt indeed tells us of ſome, *Who made themſelves Eunuchs for the Kingdom of Heaven*, Mat. 19. 12. that is, who voluntarily choſe a devout cœlibacy, not who obliged themſelves againſt Marriage by the Religion of a Vow. But if the Vow of Chaſtity is ſo ſacred, I hope, they keep it better now, than ſome of their Predeceſſors have done; unleſs they think the Vow of Chaſtity only obliges them not to marry, but does not reſtrain them from a vagrant luſt.

IX. *All Chriſtian Excellencies are commanded.*

A. This I think St. *Paul* has determined, Phil. 4. 8. *Finally Brethren, whatſoever things are true, whatſoever things are honeſt, whatſoever things are juſt, whatſoever things are pure, whatſoever things are lovely, whatſoever things are of good report, if there be any virtue, and if there be any praiſe, think on theſe things.* If theſe general Expreſſions do not comprehend *all Chriſtian Excellencies*, I know not what does. And indeed, whatever Virtues are commanded, we muſt always reckon that the heights and perfections of thoſe Virtues are commanded,

ded, for God can command nothing leſs than a perfect Virtue; and it is apparent, he has annexed no Limitations to his commands; for we are required *to be perfect, even as our Father, which is in Heaven, is perfect.* Not that every man ſhall be damned, who does not attain to the higheſt Perfections; for through the Merits and Interceſſion of our Saviour, God will accept of a ſincere, tho imperfect Obedience; but ſincerity it ſelf requires our endeavours after Perfection, which could not be our duty, if it were not commanded; and tho a ſincere Chriſtian ſhall be ſaved notwithſtanding his many defects, yet our reward ſhall be proportioned to our ſeveral Degrees and Attainments in Virtue. Nothing is a *Chriſtian Excellency*, but what is an inſtance of ſome Virtue, which is commanded, which will throw a great many meritorious Works, which our Author had an eye on, out of this number, and every degree and act of Virtue becomes more or leſs neceſſary to us, according to our different Qualifications and Circumſtances of Life, according to our Saviours rule, *to whom much is given, of them ſhall be much required.* Theſe uncommanded Chriſtian Excellencies are what the Church of *Rome* call *Works of Supererogation*, which our Church has condemned, Art. 14. in theſe words. *Voluntary Works beſides, over and above Gods commandments, which they call Works of Supererogation, cannot be taught without Arrogancy and Impiety. For by them men do declare, that they do not only tender unto God as much as they are bound to do, but that they do more for his ſake, than of bounden duty is required; whereas Chriſt ſaith plainly, When ye have done all that are commanded to you, ſay, that we are unprofitable Servants.*

X. *Every Soul, as ſoon as expired, is convey'd to Heaven or Hell.*

A. The Scripture gives us no account of any other places of rewards and puniſhments in the other World, but Heaven and Hell, and therefore we know of no other. Our Church has expreſly determined, Art. 22. *That the* Romiſh *Doctrine of Purgatory, is a fond thing, vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of*

God. Now, that there are no other places of rewards and punishments but Heaven and Hell, and that there is no such place as Purgatory, where the Souls of Men, who have any Sins to expiate, are purged and tormented with Fire, are Negative Articles, and therefore not to be proved by expreſs and poſitive Teſtimonies of Scripture. But that *every Soul, as ſoon as expired, is conveyed to Heaven or Hell*, is only an inference from this Doctrine, that we know of no other place they ſhould go to after Death, the Scripture having not told us of any other, and Chriſts parable of *Dives* and *Lazarus*, and St. *Paul*'s deſire *to be diſſolved, and to be with Chriſt*, looking fairly that way. And yet our Church has not poſitively determined this, in reverence, I ſuppoſe, to many of the Ancient Fathers, who did aſſert an intermediate ſtate between Death and Judgment, not a Purgatory, where the Souls of good Men were puniſhed for their Sins, but a ſtate of eaſe and reſt, tho not the higheſt Heavens.

XI. *Deſiring the Interceſſions of the Bleſſed, is more Superſtitious, and Derogatory to our Lord's Mediatorſhip, than entreating the Prayers of Holy Men Militant.*

A. This is as plain in Scripture, as that Chriſt is our only Mediator in Heaven, who alone (like the high Prieſt under the Law, who was his Type) is admitted into the Holy of Holies to make Expiation, and to intercede for us. As great a difference as there is between the mutual Prayers of good Men for each other on Earth, and the Interceſſion of Saints for us in Heaven, by ſo much more does the Interceſſion of Saints in Heaven invade the Office and Mediatorſhip of Chriſt, than the Prayers of good Men on Earth. Good men on Earth pray for each other as humble Supplicants, as Members of the ſame Body, as ſubject to the ſame Temptations: Saints in Heaven intercede as powerful Favourites, who by their merits and intereſt with God, obtain Bleſſings for us; and any meritorious Interceſſion is inconſiſtent with the only Mediatorſhip of Chriſt in Heaven. But ſuppoſe we could not prove, that the Interceſſion of Saints in Heaven,

is

is any more inconſiſtent with the Mediatorſhip of Chriſt, than the Prayers of good Men on Earth are; does this prove, that we may pray to Saints with all the Solemnities of Devotion, that we do to God or Chriſt, which is to give Divine Honours to Creatures; tho he minces the matter, and calls it, *deſiring the Interceſſions of the Bleſſed*; and might with as good reaſon call his Prayers to Chriſt, only deſiring the Interceſſions of Chriſt; and his Prayers to God, only deſiring ſome Bleſſings of God, as he does of his Friends on Earth. The ſum of what we teach about this matter, is this. That we muſt worſhip none but God, and therefore muſt not pray to Saints and Angels, as our Saviour teaches, *Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve.* That there is but one Mediator between God and Man, the Man Chriſt Jeſus, and therefore we muſt not make more Mediators to our ſelves, nor put our truſt in the Interceſſion of Saints and Angels. Thus far we have plain Scripture proof. And then we think common Senſe teaches us the reſt, That it is an Injury to an *only* Mediator, to ſet up other Mediators with him. That good Men on Earth are not Mediators, but Supplicants, which is no encroachment on Chriſt's Mediatorſhip; and that Saints in Heaven, according to the Church of *Rome*, pray as Mediators and Interceſſors, who appear in the Preſence of God for us; and this is not reconcilable with Chriſt's only Mediatorſhip in Heaven.

XII. *Honouring the Croſs, the Reliques and Repreſentations of our Lord and his Saints, with that degree of Reverence as we do the Goſpels, (commonly kiſs'd and ſworn by) Altar, and other Sacred Utenſils, is Idolatry.*

A. This is a very reaſonable *Requeſt*, to require us to prove that by Scripture, which we do not believe! Papiſts indeed would excuſe that Worſhip, which they pay to the Croſs, to Reliques and Images, by ſaying, That it is no more than that Reverence, which we allow to the Goſpels, and Religious Utenſils, which is no more than an external Reſpect; but do thoſe, who charge them with Idolatry in worſhipping the Croſs,

Croſs, and Reliques, and Images, charge them only with giving ſome external Reſpects to them, or with giving them formal acts of Worſhip and Adoration? As both the Decrees of their Councils, and the viſible Practice of their Church proves: And if he would have this proved to be Idolatry, he may meet with ſome Proteſtants, who will be ready to oblige him.

XIII. *The Pope is Antichriſt.*

A. This indeed has been affirmed by ſome Proteſtants, but is no Article of our Church, and therefore we are not bound to prove it, but when we have a mind to it. No man ever pretended that there is any ſuch Propoſition in Scripture, as that the Pope of *Rome* is Antichriſt, but ſome think that the Characters of Antichriſt and the *Man of Sin*, are much more applicable to him, than the Univerſal Headſhip and Infallibility.

XIV. *Every Prayer, us'd in Divine Offices, muſt be in a Language vulgar, and intelligible to every Auditor.*

A. Why he ſhould put us upon proving this from Scripture, I cannot tell, when he knows that St. *Paul* has a whole Chapter to prove it, 1 *Cor.* 14. unleſs he has ſome reſerve in expreſſing it by *every Prayer.* For that indeed, St. *Paul* does not ſay in Words, but his Reaſon ſaies it. For if the Reaſon he aſſigns againſt Prayers in an unknown Tongue, extend to all Prayers; then it proves, that every publick Prayer ſhould be in a Language underſtood by the People. But what is this to the Church of *Rome*, who has all publick Offices in an unknown Tongue? Yes, if they could prove it lawful *ever* to pray in an unknown Tongue, they would preſently prove it lawful always to do ſo; and thus St. *Pauls* diſcourſe againſt praying in an unknown Tongue is confuted for want of ſaying that we muſt never pray in an unknown Tongue. But whether it be not more reaſonable to conclude from St. *Pauls* diſcourſe againſt praying in an unknown Tongue, that we muſt never do ſo, than from his not ſaying, that we muſt never pray in an unknown Tongue, that

we

we may always do ſo, let any man judg, who has not renounced his own underſtanding.

XV. *A Company of Chriſtians, voluntarily ſeparating from all other Chriſtian Societies, condemning their Doctrines and Rites, deſtitute alſo of any viſible Correſpondence with them in the Euchariſt, in any Religious Aſſemblies or Solemn Devotions, can, notwithſtanding this perverſe, intire, and manifeſt Separation, be a myſtical Member of Chriſt, in Catholick Unity, and a Charitable Part of the Catholick Church.*

A. If he applies this to us, it is manifeſtly falſe; for tho' we do not communicate with the Church of *Rome* in her corrupt Worſhip, yet there are many Chriſtian Churches, with which we can and do communicate, and ſeparate our ſelves no farther from any ſociety of Chriſtians, than they ſeparate themſelves from the Primitive and Apoſtolick Churches. But to gratifie him, Suppoſe that all the Communions of Chriſtendom were corrupted in their Worſhip, ſo that we could not ſafely communicate with any one of them but our own; yet if the Church of *England* be a true Apoſtolick Church, in Faith and Worſhip, and Government, and ſeparates from others only upon account of ſuch corruptions, as will juſtifie ſuch a ſeparation, what ſhould hinder her from being *a myſtical member of Chriſt, in Catholick unity, and a charitable part of the Catholick Church?* The true Apoſtolick Faith and Worſhip does certainly make us the *myſtical members* of Chriſt's Body, or elſe I deſire to know, what does? *Catholick Unity* is not violated by a juſt ſeparation, and dangerous corruptions in Faith and Worſhip are a juſt cauſe of ſeparation: *Come out from among them, and be ye ſeparate, ſaith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing, and I will receive you*, 2 *Cor.* 6. 17. and where there are ſuch corruptions, ſo fatal and dangerous to mens ſouls, how far ſoever ſuch corruptions have ſpread, it is a greater act of charity to ſeparate, than to communicate with them, as it is greater charity to reprove men for their ſins, and forſake their company, than to joyn with them in a wicked confederacy. This is

the

the true ſtate of the caſe, and this we can prove either from the expreſs words of Scripture, or from eaſie and neceſſary conſequences; and this ſhows that it is poſſible, *that a company of Chriſtians*, (not) *voluntarily* (but neceſſarily) *ſeparating from all other Chriſtian Societies, condemning their* (corrupt) *Doctrines and Rites, deſtitute alſo of any viſible correſpondence with them in the Euchariſt, in any Religious Aſſemblies, or ſolemn Devotions*, (upon account of ſuch corruptions) *can notwithſtanding this* (not) *perverſe* (but juſt and neceſſary) *ſeparation, be a myſtical member of Chriſt, in Catholick unity, and a charitable part of the Catholick Church*, which is not meerly the preſent Church of one age, but the whole Church, from the times of Chriſt and his Apoſtles to the end of the world. For could we ſuppoſe at any time all the Communions of Chriſtendom to be corrupt but one, that one uncorrupt Church muſt forſake the communion of all others, and yet it would be a member of Chriſt, and a charitable part of the Catholick Church, unleſs it be only numbers, not the purity of Faith and Worſhip, which makes the Catholick Church?

XVI. *The whole Clergy of the Catholick Church may apoſtatize from Fundamental Truth and Holineſs; whilſt part of a National Laity may preſerve both, diſcover the Clergies Defection, and, depriving them, heap to Themſelves Teachers of their own ſending and inſtruction.*

A. What he intends by this, I cannot well gueſs; I ſuppoſe, he would have his Readers believe, that the whole Clergy of the Chriſtian world did at the time of the Reformation maintain the Doctrines of the Church of *Rome*, which were rejected and condemned only by the major vote of a Parliament of Lay-men in *England*; which how falſe it is, all the world knows. For,

1. There were many other Churches, and better parts of the Catholick Church, than the Church of *Rome*, which did not own thoſe Doctrines and corruptions, which we reject.

2. Nay the whole Clergy of the *Roman* Church did not. For were

were not our *Engliſh* Biſhops and Clergy as Zealous in the Reformation, as any Laymen? And were not they Biſhops in Communion with the *Roman* Church? Were not the *German* Reformers of the Clergy? And was the whole Clergy then againſt the Reformation? Theſe are admirable things to be proved by direct Teſtimonies of Scripture.

3. Nor do we ſay, that the *Roman* Church her ſelf has *Apoſtatized from fundamental Truth and Holineſs*. We do grant, that they have retained the true Faith and Worſhip of Chriſt, tho they have fatally corrupted both, by Additions of their own.

4. If the firſt diſcovery of this Defection had been made by Laymen, and afterwards acknowledged by the Clergy, who joyned in the Reformation, I ſhould not have thought the Reformation ever the worſe for it. For if the Clergy corrupt Religion, we have Reaſon to thank God, if he opens the Eyes of honeſt and diſintereſted Laymen. But is not this Author very modeſt in his Requeſts, who would have us prove his own Calumnies, and ſpiteful Inſinuations from Scripture?

This, I think, is Anſwer enough to his *Requeſt*. And as for his following Harangue, there is little in it to be anſwered, but ſome ſpiteful and ſenſleſs Reflections, which are better deſpiſed then anſwered. But let us briefly conſider ſome of them, leſt he ſhould think they cannot be anſwered.

1. He ſaies, *In theſe poſitive Propoſitions, our Religion chiefly conſiſts*. And truly it is a very ſorry Religion, if it does. But why does not our Religion conſiſt in believing the true Catholick Faith contained in the ancient Creeds? In worſhipping God through the Mediation of Jeſus Chriſt, according to the Rules of the Goſpel? In obeying all thoſe holy Laws our Saviour has given us? In obſerving the Sacraments of his own Inſtitution, and as he has inſtituted them? This is all the Religion we own, and know no other; and why then is not this our Religion? No, *This is the Churches peculiar, and claimed by her againſt all Novel and Unjuſt, both Foreigners and Out-laws*. But if this be our Religion, and the Religion of the Catholick Church, how

come we to be *Foreigners and Out-laws?* Why does not the Catholick Faith and Worſhip, make us Members of the Catholick Church? And then we have as good a claim to the Creed and Sacraments as they. No, ſaies our Author, *Whatever they have invented and choſen, that belongs (as ſin to a depraved will) properly to them; thence they derive their Title, and thereto muſt we preciſely confine their Religion.* But now if we have invented and choſen nothing elſe, what then? How do we loſe our right to the Creed and Sacraments, *&c.* becauſe we will allow of no new Inventions and Additions to it? And yet this is the plain caſe. Our only Diſpute with the Church of *Rome*, is about thoſe corrupt Additions they have made to the Catholick Faith and Worſhip, without any Foundation in Scripture, or Reaſon, or true Antiquity; and therefore our Religion is *preciſely confined* to the old Catholick Faith and Worſhip of the Chriſtian Church, and therefore is properly ours (if they will allow us to have any) becauſe it is all we have. The *German* Reformers indeed, were called *Proteſtants*, from proteſting againſt the Corruptions and Innovations of the Church of *Rome*, and this only ſhows what they do not believe, and what they will not practice; but they have a better name than this, and that is Chriſtians, which ſhows what their poſitive Faith and Religion is, *viz.* that Faith and Worſhip, which was taught by Chriſt and his Apoſtles, and owned and practiſed by the Primitive Church, before theſe Corruptions and Innovations were heard of; and therefore, this is *preciſely* our Religion; what we proteſt againſt, we declare not to be our Religion; ſo ridiculous is it, preciſely to confine our Religion to it.

2*ly*, The next ſubject of his Harangue, is our demands of Scripture-proofs from the Church of *Rome* for their new Faith and Worſhip, which I confeſs is a very hard Requeſt, becauſe they have none. However, he ſays, this makes it juſt for the *Catholick Church* (as they will needs call themſelves) to retort this demand upon us, and to demand our Scripture-proofs; and I confeſs, there is great reaſon for it, and I hope, have done him juſtice;

juſtice; for I ſuppoſe, he would not ask more of us, than we do of them. Now we only demand either the expreſs words of Scripture, or plain and evident conſequences, or the ſilence of Scripture, to prove that a thing is not revealed; and this we are ready to return them as to any Doctrines which we profeſs; and whether we *adulterate Scriptures by corrupt Tranſlations* (ſuch as the vulgar *Latin*) *or Sacrilegious mutilations* (as by leaving out the ſecond Commandment) or *blaſphemous miſapplications* (as applying the Pſalter of *David* to the Virgin *Mary*, by changing *Lord* into *Lady*) or *groſs wreſtings and falſe interpretations* (as proving Supremacy and Infallibility by *Tu es Petrus*, and *Paſce oves*) ſhall be left to every Impartial Reader.

3*ly*, In the next place he reproaches us with the *Socinians*, whom he calls our *Brethren by deſcent and iniquity* who *ſteering by the blaſt of a private ſpirit, the Chart of clear Scripture, and Compaſs of Humane reaſon, have made ſhipwrack of faith.* This is intollerable to ſay, that to follow Scripture and Reaſon, is the way to make ſhipwrack of Faith; which can never be, unleſs Scripture and Reaſon be contrary to Faith, which indeed they are in many things to the Faith of the Church of *Rome*; but God forbid they ſhould be to the true Chriſtian Faith. But have not the *Socinians* made ſhipwrack of Faith by following clear Scripture and Humane reaſon? And will he then ſay, that Scripture and Reaſon are on the *Socinian* ſide? If they be, how can he know that they have made ſhipwrack of Faith? if they be not, then they make ſhipwrack of Faith by not adhering to clear Scripture and Reaſon; and is this a reaſon for us to be aſhamed of following Scripture and Reaſon, becauſe the *Socinians* err by the abuſe of both? There is no doubt, but men who pretend to Scripture and Reaſon may err; and it is demonſtrable, that men who renounce Scripture and Reaſon, muſt err; and we have ſo many inſtances of this in the Church of *Rome*, that it is no great encouragement to us to rely on Church-authority without Scripture and Reaſon. They dare not ſay, that we muſt believe

*EC65.Sh547.B687a
THE HOUGHTON LIBRARY
24 February 1932

lieve contrary to Scripture, or that the Scripture is not the Rule of our Faith; but they will allow no body to interpret the Scripture but the Church of *Rome*, which is the most certain way to make her infallible; for to be sure she will not interpret the Scripture against her self; she must be always in the right, if what she says be the Rule of Faith. But we who cannot believe, that God has given us Scripture and Reason to make no use of them; That he has made the Pope or Church of *Rome* infallible, and divested all other Christians of sense and common understanding, have nothing but Reason and Scripture to steer by, and that will neither make us *Socinians*, nor *Papists*.

4*ly*, His parting-blow is about the Supremacy of the King, which he calls *Hobbism*, as if we ever thought, that all men must be of the Kings Religion, *as the sole and Sovereign Judg of all Causes Spiritual?* What we mean by the Kings Supremacy, I have already explained. He has no Spiritual Jurisdiction properly so called; can neither ordain, nor administer the Sacraments, nor has the power of the Keys, but is ἐπισκοπὸς ἔξω, as the Church is incorporated into the State, so he has the Government of all Ecclesiastical Persons and Causes. Whatever Secular Authority the Church has, is derived from the Prince, and depends on Secular Laws, and this may be enlarged, retrenched, suspended, by the same Power that gave it; but the Church as a Spiritual Society has Rights of its own, can teach the true Faith, administer Sacraments, inflict Church-Censures, though without any Temporal effect, by an inherent Authority: We thank God, when our Prince, who has the Supreme Authority, does countenance true Religion; But whenever it is otherwise, we are taught to submit all our Temporal Concernments, our Lives, and Bodies, and Estates, to the will of our Prince, but to defend our Church and Religion by a modest, but resolute profession of the true Faith, and meek and patient suffering for it. *FINIS.*

ADVERTISEMENT.

There is newly Published two Books, *viz.* A Protestant of the Church of *England*, no *Donatist*, &c. Also an Answer to a late Dialogue between a New Catholick Convert and a Protestant, *&c.* Both Sold by *T. Basset* at the *George* near St, *Dunstan's* Church in *Fleetstreet*.